

METHODIST PROTESTANT

RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.

For the Methodist Protestant.

MARYLAND.

Somerset County, December 3, 1833.

Dear Brother,—I have been looking for some time to see something in the Methodist Protestant about our Circuit, (Snow Hill and Princess Anne,) but I have looked in vain. I met Bro. Williams, (one of the circuit preachers) to-day, returning from a tour round the circuit—he says the people are seeking religion, and times are quite lively. We have added to our church in this circuit, since last May, about 80 members, and I hope we shall be able to give a better report in the spring. We have now our house of worship, "Salem," very handsomely finished within and without, and well lighted with eight globe lamps, while we must acknowledge our gratitude for a donation of fifty dollars, handed by Rev. Doctor F. Waters, from his daughter, Miss Mary F. Waters, of Baltimore, and which has enabled us to finish our church in so complete a manner. Our friends about 16 miles below Salem, and in Annessex, have just commenced building a house of worship 30 by 34 feet. A sufficiency of money is subscribed to complete it. We are doing well on this part of our circuit considering all things. We have nothing to fear but sin and ourselves.

On our circuit we have nine houses of worship, and three more building, may God bless and prosper our little church, which is the daily prayer of your friend and brother in Christ,
WILLIAM H. WATERS.

For the Methodist Protestant.

NORTH CAROLINA.

Guilford Circuit, December 2, 1833.

Dear Brother,—Since I wrote you last, our Camp-meeting at Germantown took place according to appointment, on the 4th of October; and notwithstanding I have delayed till now, I think it may not be amiss to give you some account thereof. I think it probable, that among all the places in North Carolina, where Protestant Methodism is established, that none have had more difficulties to encounter than in this.

Last April I arrived here, and preached my first sermon in the Court House to a large and attentive congregation. Previous to this time there had been but one sermon preached in this neighbourhood by any of our ministers, and that was by our President during the past year. From that time I continued my visits and preached once in four weeks through many oppositions: and for the sake of the good cause of Christ, I would to God that these could be forever forgotten. I do believe that we in part owe our success to the violent opposition we met with from the M. E. preacher and some of his adherents. However, to come to the point.—Our friends towards the latter part of the summer, petitioned us to give them a Camp-meeting, which was

appointed; and commenced as above named, and continued from day to day, till Wednesday following. On the afternoon of the day of its commencement, I arrived on the encampment; and had I an angelic pencil, I should fall far short in depicting to you my feelings on that occasion. Four weeks previous to that time, I went out in company with a few of the friends to select a place for the encampment, near the Academy, which is a little from the suburbs of the village, in a pleasant grove which is both delightful and romantic, and which would seem from its very appearance, as if the Great Architect of the universe designed it as the theatre of some blissful scenes, and which we selected for the encampment. I then pursued my appointment, not expecting to return to the place till near the commencement of the meeting—and acknowledge, that often, I felt somewhat unpleasant, when I would think of the friends at Germantown, and knowing the opposition they had to encounter—fearing they might faint by the way. But these heroic men who had undertaken this good cause, were not easy to be driven from their purpose: and notwithstanding some would come and tell them that we "were nothing but a set of false prophets"—"that reform was going down," &c. Yet they persevered. And when I arrived within the encampment, and looked around, I saw that in these four weeks there had almost a little village sprung up on this delightful spot, furnished with some of the largest and most commodious tents I ever saw at any place—an excellent stand and altar, with a covering over them sufficient to shelter some hundreds! While viewing these things, the tear of gratitude started in my eyes, and my soul breathed forth ejaculations of praises to God that we had found such friends in this somewhat strange land. Several of our brethren in the ministry were in attendance, *though the places of their residence were "far away."*—among whom was our beloved bro. Albright, one of our conference missionaries for the present year—who poured forth that heavenly eloquence and zeal which he usually manifests when he addresses poor dying sinners on the all-important subject of the religion of Jesus. I pray God to reward these brethren for their labors of love. And will not God reward these brethren and friends that have spent their time and money in preparing the encampment and sustaining the meeting? Yes, blessed be his holy name; he has already rewarded some of them with overwhelming showers of divine grace, and has converted some of their relations, friends, &c. Others feel well rewarded from a consciousness of having endeavoured to aid in forwarding the great cause of God. I pray that God may reward them both in time and eternity. The meeting terminated in the conversion of about 30 souls.

We have formed a small society at this place, which I hope will stand as firm as a rock, and defy the storms that agitate the ecclesiastical world. The brethren are fitting the Academy

as a house of worship for us, which will be calculated to accommodate a considerable congregation. Thus you see, my brother, the Lord prospers us, even amidst opposition. Surely if we remain a holy and zealous people, God will give us success. Our cause is glorious and has nothing to fear from investigation.—Then let every man be at his post, and labor for the good and glory of God—and no weapon formed against us shall prosper. Yours, &c.

JOHN F. SPEIGHT, Sup't.

RELIGIOUS.

For the Methodist Protestant.

THE SUFFERINGS OF CHRIST.—No. 2.

Mr. Editor,—In my last number I treated on the incarnation of the blessed Redeemer of the world. In our present paper we shall speak particularly of His sufferings. We hear but little more of Him after leaving the arms of aged Simeon, until He is about twelve years old, at this age His parents take Him to the temple as was the ancient custom. On their return they miss their Son, and immediately a parental solicitude for His welfare, caused them to return in search of Him—whom they found discoursing in the temple, to the no little astonishment of Philosophers and Doctors of the place. The sacred historians record no more about Him until He is approaching the age of thirty years—about this time we hear His forerunner, John, in the wilderness, crying, "Behold the Lamb of God who taketh away the sin of the world."—He goes unto John to have a certain ceremony or ordinance performed, which the law required in setting apart a priest for His holy office. John hesitates and says, "I have need to be baptised of Thee, why cometh thou unto me"—suffer it to be so now, for thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness. Evidently alluding to the law, which required that a man should be washed and anointed with oil before he enters upon the duties of his office. Exodus, 29 chap. Thus we see He came not to destroy the law, but to fulfil. Then John proceeded to the performance of this sacred duty, and when he had washed or baptised Him, instead of the common oil being used in anointing, the Holy Ghost descended and sat upon His head in the shape of a dove—a voice from above was heard "saying this is my beloved son," giving incontestible evidence of the existence of the holy trinity. He now commences his public ministry, and one of the Apostles writes His character or history in this short but expressive and elegant sentence, "Jesus of Nazareth, who went about doing good." No language can be more expressive and more elegant—and although there should be volumes written on Christ's life and character, it would all amount to Jesus of Nazareth who went about doing good. The works of His life are a continual scene of active benevolence. The many miracles wrought by Him, declare unequivocal-

ly that it was His delight to alleviate the wretchedness of fallen man. Are there any diseased? He rebukes the disorder—any lame? on application to Christ they are quickly restored to soundness—any blind, crying for a restoration of sight? Christ speaks (and darkness which had hitherto sat like some sad incubus on his obscure vision, departs,) and the genial rays of light penetrate and enter the receptacle of darkness. Any widow, sad and disconsolate, following her only son to the iron tomb, from which one had never risen? He meets the mourning crowd, and turns their weeping into joy, young man I say, arise, and it was so. Any Martha's and Mary's weeping on account of the departure of an only brother? Christ views the scene of affliction and weeps, and with the voice of God he speaks, and to the fond embrace of weeping, distressed relatives, Lazarus comes forth.

Notwithstanding this practical proof, given of His love to man, yet some whose hearts were desperately wicked, looked upon Him with a jealous eye, and planned His destruction—but their plans laid to entangle Him, like morning dew, quickly vanished in the presence of Him "who spoke as never man spoke." When it was found impossible to entangle Him by questions, they to baser means resort. To one whom they knew was easily tempted with silver—they approach, and with him bargain—he for thirty pieces of trash, which fools admire, sold his Lord and Master:—see Him into the garden retire—see Him stretched—hear Him cry, Father if it be possible, let this cup pass from Me, viz. if man can be redeemed without my suffering, let it be, if not, not as I will, but as Thou wilt.

His agony was such, that He sweat as it were great drops of blood. O Son of God, was ever love, was ever agony like thine! He is betrayed by one, who should have loved Him better, into the hands of his enemies. He is taken into Pilate's hall, where He undergoes a mock trial, and when Pilate would have released Him, not finding any thing in Him worthy of death,—The Jews cry out, Crucify Him! crucify Him!! He came unto His own, and His own received Him not, but basely cried out, crucify Him. O depravity, what hast thou not done—thou hast crucified the Lord of glory! They crowned Him with a crown which is the spontaneous production of fallen earth; which crown pierced his tender temples. He does not resist—they are determined upon his destruction—they appoint a day for His final execution—they compel Him to bear His own cross on his shoulder to the destined place—see His humanity sinking beneath the load. Could we be ushered into a room where might a model of the ten thousand inventions made to torture man, after examination, we should say, that of the cross was the most excruciating—for those acquainted with anatomy, acknowledge that a wound inflicted in the hand or foot, is far more painful than a wound of the same magnitude, inflicted on any other part of the body. Historians tell us that the punishment was so dreadful, that those alone were thus punished who were guilty of the most violent outrages. They decree that Christ shall die, and to the cross they nail Him—He submits, though He could have called twelve legions of angels to His rescue, though He had power to have unchained the thunders of extermination from His Father's throne and crushed those rebels, yet His love for the human family was such He silently submits. Learn a lesson frail man before He expires and imitate the example, "Father forgive them, for they know not

what they do." He bows his head and gives up the ghost.

"I asked the Heaven what foe to God hath done This unexampled deed? The heavens exclaim, 'Twas man; and me in horror snatched the Sun From such a spectacle of guilt and shame. I asked the sea—the sea, in fury boiled, And answered in a voice of storms, 'twas man. My wave in panic, at his crime recoiled, Disclose the abyss and from the centre ran. I asked the earth—the earth replied, aghast, 'Twas man; such strange pangs my bosom rent, That still I groan and shudder at the past. To man, gay, smiling, thoughtless man, I went, And asked him next. He turned a scornful eye, Shook his proud head, and deigned me no reply."

In my next, I will treat particularly on the resurrection and ascension of the crucified Redeemer. S. J. H.

Halifax, N. C. November 20, 1833.

ECCLESIASTICAL.

For the Methodist Protestant.

A PLAIN STATEMENT OF OUR VIEWS CONCERNING CLASS LEADERS.—No. 2.

Mr. Editor,—Since writing my former paper on this subject, I have seen a second from the pen of "Amicus;" and as correct views of this matter are essential to our ultimate prosperity as a religious community, it deserves some further discussion.

Be assured I have no less indignation and contempt for priestly craft and dominion, than I had at any former period of my labours in the cause of reform; nor have I any less solicitude to promote the liberty of the people; but let it not be forgotten that ministers are a part of the people, and that liberty is as dear to them as to other men. The laity are not only liable to be greatly deceived concerning the true nature of liberty, but they are equally prone with ministers to set up the fond claims of *authority, sovereignty, and infallibility*, whenever they see a favorable opportunity; and I cannot divest myself of the conviction, that the divine right of kings and priests, and the independent sovereignty of the multitude, stand exactly on the same foundation.

On the subject before us, my first remarks relate to *responsibility*. We are, all of us, in the first place, responsible to our Lord Jesus Christ. In the second place, all officers, according to our institutions, are responsible to the whole church. Members of the General Conference are subject to the power of *suffrage*. So are the delegates of Annual Conferences; and the ministerial members of those bodies are also responsible to the people, inasmuch as their delegates have power to examine the moral and official character of the ministry, and to deal with them according to the result of that examination.

In regard to class leaders and superintendents, I think "Amicus" is mistaken concerning their responsibility, unless I have misunderstood his meaning. He seems to represent class leaders as being responsible to the leaders' meetings, and the superintendents to the quarterly meeting conference. This is not correct in either case, unless the word responsibility be specially qualified. The leaders' meeting has authority, it is true, to *inquire* into the conduct of leaders; and the quarterly conference, into the conduct of superintendents; and this, I own, implies the power of *impeachment*; but leaders,

in the proper sense, are only responsible to the quarterly conference, and superintendents to the annual conference; because these are the bodies which have the power of *suspension or expulsion*.

My observations refer, secondly, to *ministerial duty*. "Amicus" has enumerated several particulars, where a minister can discharge his duty, without the agency of class leaders. True: because in those matters he does not act as an executive officer, but as a *servant* of the Lord Jesus Christ, and of the whole church. He can *preach* and *visit the sick*, and *admonish* the society, and "keep his own soul alive to God," without the official aid of class leaders; but in these matters he is acting as a *servant*, and not as an officer.

But, thirdly, when we view a minister as an *executive officer*, the case is very different: here he acts as the agent of an *executive body*; and if in this matter he shall find another body, possessing authority which is *independent* of the one that commissioned him, this will produce "confusion, and every evil work." There will be anarchy, conflict, and contradiction.

Now, in regard to superintendents, my statement was, that they "cannot execute discipline but through the agency of class leaders, or others." Upon this, "Amicus" produces some executive duties, in which the concurrence of class leaders is not necessary. But how stands the matter, in regard to "others?" What are his specifications? First, "receiving persons on probation." This the superintendent cannot do without the consent of the society; therefore it is done through the subordinate agency of "others." Secondly, "notifying accused members of the charge, time, place, &c. of trial." Here the superintendent can do nothing without an *accuser* or *prosecutor*; therefore he acts through the agency of "others;" and we may very justly observe, by the way, that unless he possess authority to *enjoin* on members to bring delinquents to trial, he has no power to execute discipline in these matters. Thirdly, "executing the decisions of committees." These, says "Amicus," "can all be performed by the superintendent without the aid or intervention of class leaders;" but I answer, that the superintendent must *inform* the leader of the decision of the judicial committee, and *command* him, (in case of the expulsion of a member,) no longer to keep that person in his class: and if said leader should refuse to obey, the superintendent ought to have authority "to arrest" him, and have him put out of office, by the executive body of the station. These provisions and powers are essential to all good government; and without them, unbridled anarchy will be the triumphant order of the day.

"Amicus" owns that *two* official duties of the superintendent cannot be discharged but through the agency of class leaders: first, "that of keeping an exact record of all the members belonging to the station or circuit;" and secondly, "that of obtaining from the leaders information of any who are sick or need a pastoral visit." Let him reflect, that these matters are *essential* to the superintendent's executive oversight of the society, and he will see the vast importance of class leaders, as his aids in the administration. But "the superintendent," he says, "can discharge all the remaining executive duties without the agency of class leaders." Has brother "Amicus" considered what is the meaning of an *executive officer*? It is not merely having "duties" prescribed to him; for duties are pre-

scribed to the private members of the church; yet this does not constitute them executive officers. An officer is one who has authority to enforce duty upon others; and, consequently, to have them brought to account, if they disobey. Why is a class leader an executive officer? Because he has authority to enforce duty upon the members of his class, and to bring them to account, or to inform against them, if they are rebellious.

"Amicus" observes in regard to class leaders, "nearly, if not all their duties, ministerial, representative, and financial, may be performed without the aid or agency of any superintendent: yea, even if there were no superintendent in the circuit or station." True; their duties as servants of Jesus Christ, and of the general church, might be so performed; but not their duties as executive officers. These are to be subordinate to higher officers, or we have an anomaly in government, which is a disgrace to christendom. If class leaders, as executive officers, are to act separately from superintendents, we have two governments, in one church, acting independently of each other! We have annual conferences, who send superintendents to the circuits and stations, and at the same time have officers of other independent bodies, who are fully empowered to rise up and say—be still, and hold your peace! our members shall obey us, but we will not obey you. If class leaders are fully competent to their executive duties, "even if there were no superintendent in the circuit or station," it is obvious as daylight, that we are controlled by a congregational system; and are not under a representative government.

If class leaders have received their executive power from other bodies, which are independent of the annual conferences; and if these conferences send men merely to perform "duties," without any executive control; it is plain that class leaders are the superintendents of the connexion; and our constitution is nothing more than an ingenious imposition upon the public mind.

The plain question is, which office is superior, that of superintendent, or that of class leader? If the former, then the leaders are to be subordinate; if the latter, then the word superintendent is a term improperly given, and our annual conferences are mere nominal bodies, which have no executive power whatever in the Methodist Protestant Church. If the authority of class leaders cannot be controlled by them, their executive power over the circuits and stations is cut off; and if this power does not reach to circuits and stations, pray where is the authority of annual conferences in any part of the connexion? The leader can take the entire authority over his class, and the superintendent is to have none over him!

Now from the above premises it appears to me to be a fair conclusion, Mr. Editor, that the superintendents of circuits and stations, ought to have some official agency in the appointment and displacing of class leaders. The case of stewards and trustees is quite different, because their office is confined to the funds and property of the church, the control of which should not be given to the ministry; but the office of class leader, as it relates to the morals, and disciplinary rules of christianity, is properly connected with the executive power of the whole body, and ought not to be disjoined from that central or chief superintendency, on which the harmony of all government depends.

What would be said of the discipline of an army, which should give captains of companies an independent agency, without any subordination to superior officers? What kind of an executive government should we have over this nation, if all the officers who are now appointed by the joint authority of the President and Senate of the United States, should be permitted to exert their official power so independently of the President of the United States, that he should have no voice or agency whatever either in the appointment of these officers, or in displacing them, in cases of delinquency? Would it be an improvement upon our civil constitution, thus to cut the government in two by establishing two orders of executive officers, without any connection or dependence upon each other?

The same connection and subordination of power, are equally necessary for the good government of the church. I fully agree with "Amicus," that class leaders are officers of great importance in our community; and this increases the weight of the argument, that, far from being a trifle, it is essential to our ultimate prosperity, that these officers should be appointed by the joint authority of the superintendent and the membership, and should be displaced, if delinquent, by his executive power, in conjunction with that of the quarterly conference.

I am happy to find that "Amicus" in his last paper, appears to concede nearly all I contend for. He concedes, by fair implication, that it would be proper for superintendents to have "A limited prerogative to nominate for office, and power to arrest or call to account, at the proper time and place, delinquent leaders." Now it is presumed he cannot put his finger upon a passage I have written, which implies any more than this: or at least, which would not fairly admit of this construction. If we find ourselves so near together already, it is probable nothing more is wanting, than persevering attention and candor, to cause us perfectly to harmonize.

BARTIMEUS.

For the Methodist Protestant.

Mr. Editor,—Having read with peculiar interest the many pieces flowing through your weekly paper, my attention has been more particularly drawn to several of late on the all-absorbing subject of church power. I must acknowledge that this incessant demand for more power to be given to the ministry, does a little startle me; and I cannot comprehend their ultimate design, unless it be to drive us back to the strong chains of ministerial power. When I read "Senex," it is more power could safely be given. "Amicus" thinks they have enough. But the individual writer in my eye, to whose writings I have most objection, is signed "Bartimeus." As I do not intend to meddle with all he has written, I will call the attention of our Christian public of reformers to his last piece in the Methodist Protestant, third volume, number 46, dated November 15, 1833; wherein he comments on the above two writers already mentioned.

First, then, his comment on our beloved bro. "Senex," he says, "his late tour to the ——— regions, appears to have compelled him to view human nature in a light different from former years; and happy will it be for our community if "Amicus" should be brought to cast away the 'bag of pebbles' as effectually as his friend "Senex" appears to have done." In looking through this sentence entire, it seems the bag of pebbles here meant, "is poor human nature," and that

the effect of human nature is to be dreaded on the part of the ruled, and not in the ruler, as the following sentence will clearly shew.—When "Bartimeus" admits that "Senex" has said "more power might safely be given to rulers." Again: "We are decidedly of opinion, says "Amicus," that the constitution and discipline of the Methodist Protestant Church, do clothe her rulers with ample power for all the purposes of good government." "This sentence," says "Bartimeus," surprised me, because" he says, "Amicus" has recommended more power to be given;" and that if anarchy obtain any where, "it is not because the rules are defective, or that the rulers are not clothed with sufficient power, but because the officers do not go forth to the discharge of their duty:" "that these causes" says "Bartimeus," "have operated to a considerable extent, is true, for the sentiment seems prevalent in some places, amongst preachers and people, that a free government signifies exactly, that we are to have a nice discipline to look at, and talk about, and then for every man to do what seems right in his own eyes; we depend on our good principles to do every thing; and to tell a warm hearted republican reformer that he is to obey the discipline is almost to astonish him. This he thinks, is to deprive him of his liberty, and to carry us back again into Egypt." Again: "A superintendent cannot execute discipline but through the agency of others.—If they refuse to obey him, how can he maintain good government, unless he possess power to arrest the disobedient officer, and have him put out of office, and after this should be done, it would avail nothing, if the superintendent is to exercise no agency in putting in a better officer in his place." We have now gotten on Pisgah, and look over and see the burden of their song—the power friends have long dwelt on terms rather unintelligible, but here is open and avowed specification, and what is it? Why, that the preachers and superintendents shall put in, and put out class leaders as they please—and that nothing short of such power as will enable them to exercise every feature of disciplinary government, will satisfy the high claims of our power brethren." I would respectfully ask friend "Bartimeus" if he ever knew in any civil government upon earth, such power given as he claims—but in a despotic one only? I could enumerate hundreds of cases; but let one suffice.—If the executive of any state was to call on any of the judges to execute any judicial proceeding, and the judge was to refuse to obey him, could the executive turn that judge out and put in another himself? Or I will come down to a judge sitting on the bench,—and he commands a sheriff to perform a certain duty, and the sheriff refuses, can the judge turn him out and put in one more complying?—I trow not. What then? Why the most the judge can do, is to fine him; but the sheriff was made such by the people of the county, and they alone can displace him: to the sovereign people the sheriff is indebted for office, and so in the church;—they make their leaders; and if a leader refuses to obey a superintendent, let him be reported to his church; but if the superintendent can put in and out at pleasure, they may place a colored person over us.

Our friend "Amicus," says moreover, that there is not any community of free Protestants more willing to yield obedience when requisite, than the Protestant Methodist; he must excuse our friends "Bartimeus" and "Senex" if they have not faith in this matter.—Hence these two

writers must have a very poor opinion of our brethren in general, or they introduce their misgivings for the purpose of operating on the general conference, that it may, in the language of "Senex," "place ample power in the hands of your rulers." If the sovereign people love power, and are as refractory as friend "Bartimeus" makes them out to be, I fear no laws can cure the disease for the most despotic powers upon earth have the worst subjects; the most cruel masters—the worst slaves; and the most tyrannical parents—the most disobedient children. Hence, if we seek to cure defects by law, we are fallen from grace; if we can do every thing by law, Christ has died in vain. "The truth is, Mr. Editor, that the sovereign people love power, as well as any body." Our friend "Bartimeus" must excuse us, if our faith is not so. Strong as his is, I have not seen your pages groaning number after number, and calling out "give more power to the sovereign people;" nay, but the sovereign people are well contented with our government as it is, and pray to have no alterations, at least until the sovereign people understand those already made. Here take an example of the love of mastery in the sovereign people.—"A certain passive superintendent, &c. &c." "The people took it in their heads that they had a right to make out the appointments for the hour of preaching; and the superintendent, being soft and yielding, and a good republican, &c. Here is the difficulty—this thing of permitting lay brethren to come into the councils of superintendents, is too full of republican sociality and simplicity. We are the superintendents, and cannot permit our ministration to be thwarted by the interference of these sovereign democratic republicans; we profess not to belong to that order, our advantages of learning and acquirements, cannot brook this equality, nor those who are not capable of thus dictating unto us—as such, you, the General Conference, must give us more power. I ask you, Mr. Editor, where do such sentiments come from as the above, and as many others that have gleamed through your columns for many months? Do they come from that gospel of equality we profess to believe, where it is said, he that would be greatest shall be your master, and he that would be chief shall be your servant. Now never let it be forgotten that to minister is not to rule;—they are made separate by the scriptures, and can never be amalgamated but by arbitrary power. One more quotation from "Bartimeus" and I am done. "And that the love of power is the common disease of human nature;" if so, I do most respectfully ask "Bartimeus" why, if he knows the disease so well, he still pleads so hard and so earnestly for more power. As he must be convinced that the more given to this depraved nature, is still the greater injury; and if he had the power he so eloquently pleads for—if he might use it safely, are there not others that would abuse it? And have they not now more power than they use to the glory of God and the good of the church. And moreover, I most respectfully ask, when did "Bartimeus" ever know the sovereign people to overturn any government themselves, but was it not men that came in amongst them, who, continually begging for power, promising at the same time, to use it advantageously; but no sooner than clothed with some brief authority ask for more, until lost in the vortex of tyranny. Here let me remind "Bartimeus" of the fable of the Ox and the thicket: the Ox begged some old dead limb of a tree for a helve, and no soon-

er than the foolish wood granted him his request, he cut the whole down.
K.
Georgia, 1833.

METAPHYSICS.

Translated from the French, for the Methodist Protestant.

MATERIALISM AND SPIRITUALISM.

The futation of these two opinions.

(Continued from page 384.)

The interior phenomena are only the result of the organization, the object shakes the organ, the movement communicates itself by the nerves to the brain, and from it to the heart, the heart sinking under the pressure makes an effort to deliver itself, and return the motion back to the exterior, so he explains *sensation* and *voluntary re-action*. Of the different sensations, transformed; come the *memory*, the *imagination*, and all that we call *faculties of intelligence*. The sensations accumulate in the brain combine themselves in a thousand different forms, and it is there that the ideas of *composition*, of *abstraction*, of *comparison*, in one word all possible ideas, form themselves. All the doctrine as professed an age later by Condillac, in the *treatise of sensation*, and almost to the physcolocal exactness, all those which Cabinis developed in his book of *physical and moral reports*, is found or completely exposed, or clearly presented in the philosophy of Hobbes. We may add, that he reproduced equally the principal ideas of Epicurus upon the organization of the universe; ideas, that are no less a consequence of the principle of sensation, than all the others. If we suppose that Hobbes united to the same principle with an incomparable logical vigor, a complete moral and political system, we shall be forced to agree, that no other philosopher, with the exception of Epicurus has given to materialism a greater development, and that then a few, who have embraced more objects in their speculations, and constructed a vaster system, with more important consequences.

In the struggle that has arisen between spiritualism and materialism from the time of Descartes and Gassendi, spiritualism triumphed in this sense, that after Descartes, his doctrine continued to be represented in France, by an uninterrupted succession of philosophers to the middle of the eighteenth century, while that of Gassendi was abandoned, by the metaphysicians. But this last preserved partisans among the men of the world, and from Bernier, Molier, and Chapelle, we can trace them to Voltaire. In this school of amiable and voluptuous men, the traditions of practical epicureanism and religious incredulity preserved themselves better than the metaphysical dogmas of materialism; they thought but little of the principle of sensation with Ninon de l'enclos, and for a long time the philosophy of Gassendi was dead in France. When the translation of the book of Locke revived it among his disciples, there were, then, but few in this country, except the Cartesians, capable of comprehending the *Essay upon the Understanding*; but pre-occupied by their old ideas, they were the only ones, who would not consent to examine it. But few attended to the metaphysical questions; those who embraced the new doctrines, misunderstood its true spirit, and while Berkeley and Hume vigorously deduced from it spiritualism in England; Condillac in France, found in it materialism. It will suffice to compare the first pages of the *Treatise of the Sensations*, with the second book of *The Essay upon the Understanding*, to be convinced

of the singular illusion Condillac fell into, in thinking himself a disciple of Locke. Without doubt we find after, in the two works, the same formularies; neither Locke notwithstanding his good sense, nor Condillac notwithstanding his love of clearness, are well understood; but their point of view is wholly different, Locke shut himself up in himself, and suffered the images of the external world to come to him; Condillac placed himself without, at the side of his *statute*, and composed for it a soul, with the sensations, which he gave to it in succession. That which is certain with Locke, that which he admits without discussion, that of which he disputes not, is the *me*; that which is incontestible with Condillac, that which he makes no question of, is the *external world*. The one is wholly occupied to know how the *me* can know the external world, the other to discover how the world acting upon the organs developes in the bosom of the *statue* that which we call the *phenomena of the understanding and the will*. Locke resolving his question declares, that we only know the external world, by the ideas of this world which the senses transmit to us; Condillac resolving his own, protests, that there is nothing in the *statue* but a *transformation of the sensation*. The one is always *within*, the other *without*, as they were there at the point of departure. Locke consents not to *go out* to see the bodies, he will absolutely find them in the inward fact of the *ideas*; Condillac consents *not to enter* to take cognizance of the phenomena of the soul: he resolves to deduce them from the exterior fact of *sensation*. And so that which they both seek is not where they seek it, it is evident that they will not find it, if they follow it, and that the interior reality escapes from the French philosopher, as the external reality escapes from the English.

We see that if Condillac is a disciple of Locke, the elivé is very little faithful to the principles of his master, or has but little understood his opinions. It remains, the one has not perceived, better than the other, the extent of his doctrines. Locke believed in matter very firmly, and Condillac had no bad design against the soul. We see him in the *Treatise of Sensations* debating with himself between his principle that destroys it, and his good sense, which preserves it, while, forgetting the principle, he lays it down as a distinct subject that proves the sensations; but perceiving, in this hypothesis derived not from sensation, he returns to the principle, and affirms that the soul can only be actually *proved* to be a *collection of sensations*. No philosopher has more frequently contradicted himself. In isolating and turning over such and such pages we can successively observe two or three different opinions. But it is not in these efforts, that makes a philosopher arrange his system with common sense, that we ought to seek the character of his philosophy; it is in the principle itself, which has placed his philosophy in contradistinction with common sense, and which has rendered these inconsistencies necessary. Once more, every philosopher is a man; as a man, he partakes of the faith of humanity, as a philosopher he is in search of explication. When the explication is incomplete, it almost always happens that a struggle arises between the philosopher who believes it right and would deny all that he cannot account for, and the man, who defends his faith and refuses to sacrifice his explication. It is this curious struggle which is found in all the books of philosophy. When the author is a

resolute spirit, daring, and turned to logic, as Hobbes and Berkeley, the man succumbs, and the philosopher prevails, the more deep-rooted faith of the human heart, falls as grain under the scythe, the inexorable consequences of the adopted explication; but when the author is a spirit naturally uncertain and timid, as Locke or Condillac, the philosopher takes less empire, and good sense resists with more advantage a system less decidedly accepted. Then the struggle is almost equal, and by turns philosophy prevails in one page, and common sense in another, passing through a thousand efforts to place himself in accordance with himself, the author always undecided comes to the conclusion, which is still, but his incertitudes resumed. It is in the mock writers, that it is important to distinguish the philosopher from the man, when we would judge soundly of the first, it is then, that it is necessary fearlessly to disengage the systematic principles, which belong to him and not be frightened by the inconsistencies, that come not from it, and only express the scruples of common sense. If the critics had thought of this distinction, their views would not be so embarrassed, and so little in accordance with the appreciation of certain philosophical doctrines, and if other persons should yet deign to reflect upon it, they could easily comprehend, that it is not necessary to burn the philosopher, for it is not the philosopher, but the man, who is burned; and it is never the man, who errs, but always the philosopher.

Condillac was no materialist, and yet his philosophy is materialism itself. It is not so much in his works, that it is necessary to seek it, as in the physical and moral reports of his disciple Cabanis. Here the principle of the master is disengaged from all the inextricable commentary, which accompanies it, in the *Treatise upon the Sensations*, there the doctrine has regained its true gait, and marches freely to its natural consequences. The sensation is no longer an indecisive phenomenon, half corporeal, and half spiritual; the sensation is taken as it appears to the eyes and the hands, that is to say, for an impression produced upon a certain part of the body; the nerves which terminate there are shaken, the shock communicates itself to the internal extremities, from whence it returns to the point of departure. This action, and this re-action, which every experienced physiologist can demonstrate, and of which, the nerves are the subject, constitutes, and completes the phenomena of sensation, and all the voluntary phenomena, intellectual and moral, which are nothing more than its consequences. Thus all the interior phenomena are derived from sensation, according to the principles laid down by Condillac, and sensation itself, is even traced back to what Condillac wished it to be, palpable; and in an external point of view, that is to say, to that visible phenomena of organic impression, of nervous disturbance and nervous re-action.

Behold! then the doctrine of Condillac reduced to its veritable terms. But in this doctrine, what is the *feeling subject*? There are the nerves. It is, then, the nerves, which will, which reason, which judge; our body has the organs, of which the function is to feel, to will, and to think, as it has in it the function by which it digests. What is then, the soul? A function of the body. And from whence comes to the body the privilege of a function so remarkable? From its organization. Behold! materialism in all its purity, deduced with an

invincible consequence from the principle of Condillac, which at the bottom is no more nor less than this:—*we can know nothing but with our eyes and our hands*. Whence it follows, that the soul which we do not comprehend in this manner, exists not. Whence it follows still, that all the internal phenomena is reduced to the shaking of the nerves, that our eyes, and hands, alone, are able to demonstrate.

Would you proceed further in the vigorous inductions of this doctrine? you shall find that justice and injustice, being only the transformations of the sensation, are nothing; that the only good, and the only evil we know meets in the sensation, which is now agreeable and then disagreeable; that thus all good leads back to pleasure, all evil to pain. Whence it follows, that the only principle of human conduct is to avoid pain, and to seek pleasure. Behold the moral of Helvetius, or rather of the principle, of the exclusive authority of the senses. Would you go further still? You shall find that every man pursues his own pleasure or his personal interest, without any idea of moral order, or of justice to restrain him, and impose upon him respect for others; all men are naturally enemies, and think war is the natural state, whence it follows, that the greater strength is reason; that force is the only right, and that absolute power, the principle of peace, is eminently legitimate. Behold the politics of Hobbes, that is to say, the politics which spring from the principle of authority from the senses. Would you go on? There is no merit to the man who attains pleasure, nor demerit to him who suffers it to escape; we can only see on one side ability, and on the other mismanagement; whence it follows that there is neither virtue nor crime; whence it results, that the actual state suffers of itself, and needs neither future rewards nor punishments, whence it must be concluded, that if there be a God or Gods, they concern not themselves about us, and that beyond this life there is nothing to fear or to hope, even in supposing, which is absurd, that the dissolution of the nerves draw not after it the destruction of our personality. Behold the religion of Epicurus, that is to say still, the religion of the principle of the exclusive authority of the senses!

We see then, that the exclusion and incomplete solutions of the fundamental question, draws after them, not only in metaphysics, but in morals; in politics; in religion; in every thing. Other solutions equally incomplete and exclusive, as far as to the great questions that interest humanity, and that these last solutions have met with their representatives in the philosophical schools, as well as the first.

Mr. Editor,—I send you the following translation under a persuasion that its publication will render an acceptable service to several of our young preachers, while it may prove not altogether useless to those of riper experience. To those who may feel offended at its metaphysical complexion, the following questions and answers are submitted.

Question.—What philosophy was the most popular in the Roman empire in Europe, when Christianity began to be propagated in it?

Answer.—The philosophy of Epicurus.

Q.—Is the philosophy of Epicurus, and modern materialism, or sensualism the same in substance?

A.—It is.

Q.—How was the philosophy of Epicurus revived in Europe, and in France under the name of materialism?

A.—By the pen or the writings of the philosophers.

Q.—Were these writings very argumentative and elegant?

A.—They were.

Q.—Was this philosophy the cause of the French revolution, or the consequence of it?

A.—The cause.

Q.—Did Epicureanism or materialism propagate itself without the aid of the sword?

A.—It did.

Q.—What is the difference between propagating an opinion by metaphysics or by physics?

A.—Nearly the same as that between reason and force.

Q.—Were the Epicureans or materialists of the eighteenth century professed and zealous champions of freedom of enquiry and of opinion?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Was physical force employed against them?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Were the writings of Voltaire very popular in France while he was in exile?

A.—They were.

The matter of these questions and answers is conceived to be matter of fact. In this form it may be easily remembered.

After all that has been spoken and written against infidel philosophy, it seems not to be well understood, that the bloody scenes of the French revolution, have little more to do with its continuance than with its commencement. It had prevailed over public opinion by the peaceful operations of metaphysics or reason, before the offensive or defensive sword was drawn; it prevails still by the same means. Men write and read, and talk and hear one another into Epicureans without the aid of laws, and often in opposition to them. It behoves the friends of religion to look beyond the surface, declamation can do but little now. The fact is so, however unwilling we may be to see it, that the original antagonist of Christianity is still in the field; is it certain that he is not in it, in undiminished force? Epicurean philosophy triumphed in Rome in the beginning of the Christian era, and it is the fashionable philosophy now. Let not the enemy be mistaken; if all the noisy infidels could be put to silence, but little would be gained; the deep thinkers of the closet, the men who hold "the pen of the ready writer," these are to be listened to, these must be countervailed or all may be lost.

In ages of barbarism, creeds are won or lost in the field of battle, for in such ages wars of extermination are usually waged. Even in the age of Louis the XIV. the edict of Nantz was too tolerant, it was therefore revoked. A similar attempt was in progress under Charles the Xth. But instead of the materialists following the Huguonots to the galleys and into banishment, the king and his court had to follow their footsteps. Opinion, says the adage, governs the world. Now it is certain that there is no inherent aversion in Epicurean opinion, to this universal sovereignty. It is an opinion hostile to all religion, and it is peculiarly so to the religion of Jesus in its truest forms. Is it not coming to be more and more evident, that the last enemy that Christianity will have to conquer, is Epicureanism, and that the final battle must be fought upon the field of reason. Have we not seen something analogous to this in our own day. The greatest captain of the age could not be conquered by united nations, until they learned his tactics. Indeed, such has always

been the case. The recapitulation in the conclusion of the essay shews that all the possible principles of opposition to Christianity are concentrated in the Epicurean or sensual system; and that the advocates of the system depend not upon war and conquest, but upon the greatest masters of the arts and sciences to conduct it on from conquering unto conquest. The Epicureans must be refuted, must be overthrown. Let the Christian hero count the cost, let him never lose sight of this fact, he is to war with opinion, not men. The citadel of materialism is to be subdued, not the mere outposts only. Talk as we may of the power and triumphs of grace, it must come to this, that the irreconcilable foe to religion must be out-reasoned.

The great value of this essay is, that it gives a historical view of metaphysics, or a matter of fact view. It is plain that it is the art of laying down principles and drawing inferences from them. The whole of the modern process shews how one laid the foundation and another built thereupon.

TRANSLATOR.



BALTIMORE:

FRIDAY, DECEMBER 20, 1833.

The December No. of the Protestant Episcopalian, a monthly publication of much merit, among other interesting matter, furnishes the facts—(hear it every Methodist Protestant,) that the New York Episcopalians have now established and maintain upwards of fifty Missionary Stations, all of which are supplied with ministers!—Have we not stated correctly, long since, that almost all the old denominations formerly bound down by Congregationalism, are becoming missionary in their views and operations. We say, Brethren, let us bestir ourselves. As the missionary character has been the distinguishing glory of Methodism, let us sustain our reputations as Methodists.

We do most sincerely hope, that some of our brethren will have outlines of foreign and domestic missionary arrangements ready against the General Conference.—We press this subject with earnestness. Let none say, we have enough to do in our own neighborhood, and have neither money nor preachers to spare. We must have, and spare both. For Christ's sake, and the salvation of souls, brethren, take up this subject with interest. North and South America, Asia and Africa, with the isles of sea, are waiting for the glorious gospel of their salvation.

Have we no money for this object. Have we no preachers, or shall we have none willing to "go into all the world" to proclaim the news of salvation through a crucified Saviour! May the Great Head of the Church stimulate our souls to noble deeds, on this all important theme. O let us think of the millions who are sitting in the darkness of spiritual, and which to them, may prove eternal death.

How shall we meet these in the judgment. Sisters in Christ, where are your energies diverted—and employed. As your sex was last at the cross, and first at the sepulchre of the dying and risen Christ, will ye not be first in our church to unite your efforts in behalf of home and foreign missions? After having made your preachers comfortable at home, will ye not unite to send the gospel abroad. Ye will, yes ye will.

Unite then at once to see that all is made comfortable at home, not seven years hence, but now—the present. Yea, and form your plans to send the means of spiritual and eternal life abroad, and great shall be your reward in Heaven.

"Brethren, what are we doing in our Circuit, in our Station, to promote the glory of God, and the salvation of souls?" Is this the all engrossing question? Would to Heaven it were! Suppose we bring the subject home more closely, and each brother and sister of our fellowship, when they meet each other, affectionately ask—"Brother or Sister, what are you doing for Christ and souls?" Would not the query enkindle a desire in the heart of the respondent to begin at once, and in good earnest, to do more? Well, where shall it begin? In Baltimore, in Pittsburg, in Cincinnati, in Philadelphia, in New York, in Halifax, Nova Scotia, in every city, town, village and neighborhood, throughout our fellowship? Is there not good nay the best reason, that this enquiry should become universal?

John Wesley, Adam Clarke, Francis Asbury, and a host of others, were men of laborious effort, instant in and out of season. Wherever they went, the question was—How shall I be more instrumental in winning souls to Christ? They were gloriously successful, and we may be so also—what is to hinder. Brethren, "we are Methodists," let us never forget this distinctive appellation, and the character held associate with the name—and let us take the laborious Wesley and Fletcher, for our examples—and our beloved sisters, the character and sacrifices of the amiable and indefatigable Mrs. Fletcher, as a pattern.—Above all, the example of our Lord Jesus Christ, who, although He was rich—mark! yet for our sakes became poor—for what? That we, through His poverty, might be made rich. Are you willing my own soul, my minister, my brother, my sister, to what—why, to become poor? For what—to make many rich by sending them the Gospel? Shall we be charged with writing too pungently on such subjects—not by the truly pious we are sure, for many of these desire to see more pungent articles than have yet appeared in our Journal, and we trust in God, that some of our writers will come out on these points with a soul-stirring and irresistible eloquence and pungency, and which will be felt.

Although we are a young church, yet we have materials every where, of mind and energy, to rouse the neighborhoods in which they live. O for a baptism of fire and the Holy Ghost, on the heart and soul of each minister, preacher, and member of the Methodist Protestant Church! Then should we see the goings forth of the Divine Majesty, in power and in great glory.

We have several communications on hand, which came too late for this number—they will appear as soon as practicable. W. in reply to "A."—"Querist."—Bro. Grant, in reply to Bro. Bellamy—are amongst the number. We wish bro. —, to understand with all affection, that his threat to discontinue his subscription if his piece were not published, weighed not a grain with the editor, in reference to its insertion, and therefore he might have spared himself the trouble of his postscript. We are neither to be sold nor bought. Nothing but a personal esteem for the writer prevents us from giving his note and his name.

The next Annual Conference for the East Virginia District, will commence its next session in Lynchburg, on the second THURSDAY in February next.

Our subscribers to the Mutual Rights and Methodist Protestant, will much oblige us by remitting their subscriptions through our Agents, or direct by mail, at the Publisher's risk.

Our last paper was ready for press when the balloting for Chaplain, in the House of Representatives of the United States was received.—We then merely gave the result, and now furnish the election, as reported in the daily papers.

ELECTION OF CHAPLAIN.

On motion of Mr. GRENNELL, the House proceeded to the election of a Chaplain.

Mr. WARD nominated the Rev. Thomas H. Stockton.

Mr. CLAY nominated the Rev. J. A. Copp.

Mr. WHITE nominated the Rev. W. Hammett.

Mr. ELLSWORTH nominated the Rev. R. R. Gurley.

Mr. EVANS nominated the Rev. Mr. Palfrey.

The several members proposing the respective candidates, were appointed Tellers.

On the first ballot 210 members voted—106 being necessary to a choice.

There were for Rev. Mr. Stockton,	104 votes
Rev. J. A. Copp,	33
Rev. Wm. Hammett,	50
Rev. R. R. Gurley,	6
Rev. Mr. Palfrey,	9
Rev. Mr. Smith,	1
Blank,	6
Scattering,	1

None of the candidates having the requisite number, a second ballot took place, when 194 members voted. Ninety-eight necessary to a choice.

For the Rev. Mr. Stockton,	143
Rev. Mr. Copp,	10
Rev. Mr. Hammett,	34
Rev. Mr. Gurley,	2
Rev. Mr. Palfrey,	2
Rev. Mr. Smith,	1
Blanks,	6

Whereupon, the Rev. Mr. Stockton, of the M. P. Church, was declared duly elected.

After which, on motion of Mr. STEWART, the House adjourned.

New York State Temperance Convention assembled in First Presbyterian Church in Utica, Nov. 20, 1833. The venerable Jacob Morris, Presided—six Vice Presidents, four Secretaries, and about 250 delegates were present from 39 counties.

The State Committee report the circulation of 4,438,501 Temperance Tracts, &c. making in all about 80 millions 12mo pages.

At no time has the Temperance reformation exhibited so much of promise. The current of public opinion is not only becoming less turbid, but grows deeper, broader, and more resistless and overwhelming in its course; and the time cannot be distant when being entirely purified, it shall be to our beloved country a *River of Life*, carrying joy, and peace, and salvation to every family in the Union.

The New Hampshire Society have resolved to supply every family in the State with the Temperance Recorder during the ensuing year, say 45000 families, the expence \$4,500!

The speakers on the occasion were numerous, and their speeches powerful. Amongst the latter we copy from the Evangelist, the following selections:

GERRET SMITH, Esq. of Petersboro', spoke on the question. I could fain hope there is no person in this assembly who doubts that the traffic is immoral. There may be some who doubt whether it is *expedient* for us to declare it. It is the business of the dealers to keep up the two great armies—the drunkards, and the pupils who are taking lessons of drunkenness in the school, of temperate drinking. When their business ceases to do this, it will die. There will be no use for it. Is it not immoral for them to take from a man his money, and not return an equivalent? The dealer returns what he knows is not only useless, but immeasurably worse than useless. Is it said the dealer does not know the names and effect of his business? Then he will not open his eyes to the light that is shed abroad every where around him. Is it too late to talk of excusable ignorance, at least in our state. By his providence, God has called the rum-dealer to repent, with a voice so audible, that *He* will not hold him guiltless for refusing to hear and obey.

Parent! let me illustrate the immorality of this traffic in a way that *you* can appreciate.—Suppose the rum-dealer has caused your child to love rum, and fastened him to the bar of a grocery, with a devotion more servile than that of the Hebrew servant, who in token of slavish love for his master's house, has had his ear bored to the door post. Would you say this was moral? Would you not rather, a thousand times, the slave-dealer had caught him, and loaded him with chains, and bound him to the deepest and darkest mines, than that the rum-dealer had caught him? For the slave may still have a free and a holy soul?

The rum-dealer is a supremely selfish being. Instances are known, where the wife and children of the drunkard have implored the trader not to sell the poison to the husband and father, and yet the adamant heart of the rum-dealer is utterly unmoved, by appeals which would melt the heart of any other pirates on the rights and happiness of society.

Plundered as I have been, of my relatives, and of my property, I have a right to speak, and I will speak. To illustrate the hardening influence of this immoral business, I will mention an instance which came to our knowledge recently. A poor woman (I knew her well, and her children, and their sorrows,) came to a dealer, begging him not to sell their husband and father the liquor that sent him home either a fiend or a sot. What do you think was the bloodless, cold-hearted answer of this rum-seller? It was this, "If we do not sell it to him others will!" She then went to the wife, and this nefarious traffic had hardened even the female heart. *She* replied, "I do not see as any thing can be done, perhaps you had better separate." This dealer and his wife are both members of the church, and this poor woman is a member of the same church, and they have often sat down together at the table, where they pledged their mutual sympathy and kindness and support. How can they think themselves Christians? I know if we pass this resolution, there are some dealers who will chafe and foam. But after a storm always comes a calm, and in that calm peradventure may come repentance, and thus they may chafe themselves into cold-water men. It is said that we ought not to denounce. It does not belong to cold water to denounce. It is the business of the RUM PARTY to denounce. *And well they ply it.*

Rev. Mr. Pierpont, of Boston, being present, said, "In pronouncing this traffic immoral, he

meant to be understood that it is inconsistent with that *moral law*, which God has given to every man, for the guidance of his moral conduct. He knew there was a plea of ignorance in the case. And he admitted that it had weight, since we are told that even God winked at the times of prevailing ignorance. They certainly are not *so much* to blame as those who do the same things with their eyes open. I have been told, by men whose word was as good as their bond, that they feel *no* compunction of conscience in regard to this traffic. Men certainly do that, with a quiet conscience, at one time, through ignorance, which they cannot do at another time. Paul, the apostle, tells us he *verily thought he ought* to do many things contrary to Jesus of Nazareth. And once when he was on trial, he declared that he had lived in all good conscience until this day. While, therefore, it may be true that men standing in the same blaze of light in which we stand, are guilty, those who remain in ignorance should be judged by a different rule, and are less criminal than the former. We are charged now with using hard words, when we call *these* men sinners, and pronounce their practices immoral.—But, Sir, I do not pity all ignorance. Men are excusable for not knowing the truth, so far only as they have not had opportunity to acquire the knowledge. I know there are men who willingly continue in ignorance. And I cannot pity such ignorance. I cannot but illustrate their conduct by an incident. Two clergymen in England, a dissenter and a churchman, were riding together in a stage coach, and became engaged in an amicable debate on some theological point. At length one of them takes out his card, and writes on it, in legible characters, the word TRUTH, and asked his companion if he saw it. He said, yes. Then, taking a guinea from his pocket, he placed it directly over the letters, and asked—"Do you see it now?" Sir, men can't always see the truth through the guinea. And what we want is, to dispel all those *media*, which prevent the free radiation of truth through the world. This we do by disseminating information abroad. Let truth be circulated—let your four millions of temperance papers be multiplied to 14,000,000, and more, till men cannot help seeing the nature of this traffic. Increase the light upon them, till, like Paul, they shall be struck blind by the heavenly vision.

I am ready to take the ground of this resolution, and to maintain it with all the little energy God has given me. It is morally wrong, an immorality, a sin. I will not pretend to describe the evils which grow out of this traffic. Let it be done by every man's own imagination. Pardon me, sir, it is not the work of imagination, but of sober, open-eyed observation to see its horrors, and of plain history to describe them.

It is said we ought to be restrained from passing such a resolution, by respect for the feelings of those who are engaged in the traffic. But how can I respect the feelings or interest of the man who builds his pile of wealth on these treasures of society, which wealth can neither buy nor replace? Tender of their feelings, indeed! I am told that many gentlemen have made respectable fortunes in this traffic, and are highly respectable men, and we should be tender of their feelings. But have they so been tender of the feelings of others? When they in the midst of their wealth and power have taken my solitary little ewe lamb, out of my bosom, may I not say to the butcher, "Thou art the man?" Sir, if I have not nerve enough to say this, may God

take from me what he has given. If I am not bold enough in his service, to meet the truth, let him dismiss me from his service, and put men in my place who are bold enough.

Those before me have all heard of the Minotaur, the fabled monster of Crete, who used to seize men and women, and drag their bodies to his cave, that he might riot on their flesh. Suppose now, Mr. President, this monster should come and take a beloved child, your child, my venerable friend, in your white hairs, him to whom you look for support in the going down of your sun. Will not the neighbors go out with the power of the country, to rescue the victim? You would go after him to the centre of the earth. And now shall we be told that we must stand at the door of the cave, and gently ring the bell, and tremblingly ask the imp who comes to the door, "Is your master at home?" and beg that he will please to set a time, for a gentleman, whose child he has taken, to call and ask an explanation?

Sir, I too am a father, and I cannot trim and square my words, and use set phraseology, to avoid giving offence. Sir, I expect to give offence in promoting temperance, and that offence will ripen into enmity. If he who wishes to labor in the cause of temperance faithfully, is a clergyman; they will alienate his friends, perhaps reduce his salary, or even remove him from his place. If he is a layman, they will depreciate his character, and show that there is yet vengeance in the worm of the still.

But shall I yield or be alarmed at this? No, gentlemen, you have already done what you could. You have taken my first born son, and beguiled him into your shop, in my neighborhood, and taught him to love the poison, until my child was brought home at night and thrown upon my entry floor. And am I to stand and parley with the authors of all this misery? No, sir, it is war, war to the knife, with the unholy traffic. Here is my son. Would to God you had met him on the side-walk, and buried your dagger in his bosom, and flung his bleeding corpse into my house. Then the law could have interposed to stop the course of blood.—Had you taken him into your dreary vault of rum, and bound him fast to the floor, and forced the liquor down his throat, and sat like a nightmare on his bosom, gloating over the convulsions of youth and beauty, I could have thanked you; even though I might have heard his groans and could not help him till he died in your hands. For, then, he could have gone up with clean hands, to witness before God against his murderer. But now you have broken his will, you have debased his soul, and defaced the image of God in him, and what can you do more!—Will you traduce my wife and daughter? You have already broken their hearts, and perhaps laid them in the grave. And must I model my phrases with the technical nicety of a special plea? I cannot do it."

WHAT HAVE THE MISSIONARIES DONE FOR THE HOTTENTOTS?

This question, according to Dr. Philip, was put to a Hottentot belonging to the institution at Bethelsdorp, in South Africa, by I. T. Bridge, Esq. and Major Colebrook.

"What have the missionaries done for the Hottentots?" When the missionaries came among us, we had no clothing but the filthy sheep skin kaross; now we are clothed in British manufactures. We were without letters; now we can read our bibles or hear them read to us.

We were without any religion; now we worship God in our families. We were without morals; now every man has his own wife. We were given up to licentiousness and drunkenness; now we have among us industry and sobriety. We were without property; now the Hottentots at Bethelsdorp are in possession of fifty wagons and a corresponding number of cattle. We were liable to be shot like wild beasts; and the missionaries stood between us and the bullets of our enemies."

Where the same question to be asked the same person or any other Hottentot now, he might greatly enlarge the catalogue.

MISCELLANY.

THE SLANDERER.

"Against slander there is no defence—Hell cannot boast so foul a fiend, nor man deplore so fell a foe. It starts with a word—with a nod—with a shrug—with a look—with a smile. It is pestilence walking in darkness, spreading contagion far and wide, which the most wary traveller cannot avoid; it is the heart searching dagger of the dark assassin; it is the poisoned arrow whose wounds are incurable; it is the mortal sting of the deadly adder; murder its employment, innocence its prey, and ruin its sport."

The man who breaks into my dwelling or meets me on the public road, and robs me of my property does me injury. He stops me on the way to wealth, strips me of my hard-earned savings, involves me in difficulty, and brings my family to penury and want. But he does me an injury that may be repaired. Industry and economy may again bring me into circumstances of ease and affluence; and smiles of gratitude may yet play upon the cheeks of my offspring as they receive the small token of parental love.

The man who comes at midnight hour and fires my dwelling, does me injury—he burns my roof, my pillow, my raiment, my very shelter from the storm and tempest; but he does me an injury that can be repaired. The storm may indeed beat upon me, and chilling blasts assail me, but charity will receive me into her dwelling, will give me food to eat and raiment to put on, will timely assist me in raising a new roof over the ashes of the old, and I shall again sit by my own fireside, and taste the sweets of friendship and of home.

But the man who circulates false reports concerning my character; who exposes every act of my life which may be represented to my disadvantage; who goes first to this, and then to that neighbor, tells them he is very tender of my reputation, enjoins upon them the strictest secrecy, and then fills their ears with hearsays and rumors; and what is worse, leaves them to dwell upon the hints and suggestions of his own busy imagination, the man who in this way "filches from me my good name," does me an injury which neither industry, nor charity, nor time itself, can repair. He has told his tale of slander to an uncharitable world. Some receive it as truth; others suspect the half is not told them; and others dress what they have heard in the highest colouring, add to it the foul calumny of their own inventions and proclaim it at the corners of the streets and the house tops. Should I prove myself innocent, and attempt to meet the scandal with contradiction, the story of my disgrace outstrips me, and solicitude to contradict it excites suspicion of guilt. Should the slanderer confess his crime, the blot is made, and

his tears of repentance cannot wash it out. I might as well recall the winds or quench the stars, as recall the infamy, or wipe the foul stain from my character.

I attach a high value to my fellow-men. I cannot but wish that while I live among them, I may hold a place in their affections, and be treated with the respect which is due my station. 'A good name is rather to be chosen than great riches,' or than 'precious ointment.'

"'Tis the immediate jewel of the soul,
The purest treasure mortal times afford."

Give me this, and I can face the frowns of fortune—can be pointed at as the child of poverty, and still know what it is to be happy.—Take this away, and you strike a dagger into my soul; you render life itself a burden! The frowns of a world, the finger of scorn, and the hiss of contempt, are more than a man can endure.

Yet dear as reputation is, "and in my soul's just estimation prized above all price," it is not too sacred for the slanderer to tarnish and destroy. He can take from me the confidence of my employers, the respect of my friends; can blast my reputation with his pestilential breath, and feel not a pang of remorse. He glories in nothing so much as in the slaughter of character. He would blight the fairest flower in the garden of innocence, demolish the loftiest temple of human purity, and place its broad stamp of infamy on the holiest servant of the living God.

The slanderer has not a single pretext or excuse to palliate his offence. A desire of gain may urge some men to the commission of crime; the incendiary and the assassin may be excited by this base passion to perpetrate their deeds of darkness and of death; but the man who attacks me with slander, has no hope of personal good: and if he robs me of character, he

"Robs me of that which not enriches him,
But makes me poor indeed."

He gratifies the malice of his heart, adds one more to the family of wretchedness and wo, and enjoys a secret pleasure—yea, even triumphs, as he reflects on the infamous achievement.—*Badger's Messenger.*

OBITUARY.

For the Methodist Protestant.

MRS. ELIZA WOOLRY.

During the night of the 27th Nov. 1833, our beloved Sister Woolry left us for a better world. Great is our loss—but infinite is her gain! The deceased, in early life, was the subject of God's grace, and in her 14th year attached herself to the Methodist E. Church; of which she was a worthy member about two years. In 1828, with many others, she seceded from this fellowship, and united herself with the Methodist P. Church; in whose communion she continued a useful and acceptable member until her release from the "house of her pilgrimage." In 1830, she was married to her bereaved husband, our worthy brother, Noah Woolry, with whom she lived happily about three years and four months, and left with him two sweet children, who do not yet know the full extent of their loss.

Her illness, which was long and painful, she endured with true christian fortitude. Indeed her patience and resignation were remarkable, even for a Christian. She spent the last days of her useful life, in affording encouragement and

advice to her friends around her; and attempting to console her distressed family. Several esteemed friends had the privilege of witnessing, in her end, the efficacy of religion in a dying hour, and not one can ever forget the exultation of her soul as she triumphed over death, and won an everlasting victory!

Her death has left a deep impression on the minds of her neighbors and friends, as was manifest during a brief discourse upon the occasion, from a part of 21 v. 1 ch. Philip—"And to die is gain"—as the truth was clearly exhibited in her decease. "Precious in the sight of the Lord is the death of his saints." Peace to her memory! We have sustained a severe loss—but we will submit, for we know that it is of the Lord, and may her distressed friends have grace to say "The will of the Lord be done!"

A. W.

Reisterstown, Dec. 10, 1833.

The Itinerant Ministers and Preachers of the Methodist Protestant Church, generally, are authorized Agents for this Paper and the sale of Books published under the arrangements of the General Convention. Also the following persons:—

MARYLAND.	KENTUCKY.
Chestertown, W. S. Greenwood.	Bowling Green, James D. Hines.
New Market, Fred. county,	Hopkinsville, O. Wilkinson.
Al Barney,	
Westminster, Frederick county,	NORTH CAROLINA.
Jacob Reese,	Mount Prospect, Exhum Lewh
Fredericktown, John Gephart,	Hillsborough, R. L. Cook.
Brookville, Rev. Tho. McCormick	Greensboro. Guilford co.
Rock Hk. Kent. co. Wm. Copper.	Rev. John Coe.
Reister's town, Rev A. Webster.	Plymouth, Washington co.
Sam's Creek, D. W. Nail.	Joseph S. Norman.
Walkersville, Daniel Ourland.	Raleigh J. Grant.
	Dancy's Store, Rev. Thos. Moore.
VIRGINIA.	Enfield, Benjamin Hunter.
Chuckatuck, John D. Day.	Rock Creek, Rev. Alex. Allbright.
Buckingham, C. H. Jesse Hollman.	
Harrisonburg, Henry Tutwiler.	SOUTH CAROLINA.
Lynchburg, Rev. Dr. Holcombe,	Georgetown, Rev. A. Peurifoy.
Matthews, C. H. Rev. Miles King.	Camden, Rev. John A. Russell.
Petersburg, D. Arcy Paul.	GEORGIA.
Brunswick co. Rev. E. Dromgoole	Covington, Newton co.
Burgess's Store, Rev. B. Burgess.	Rev. Aaron G. Brewer,
Princess Anne C. H., J. J. Bur-	Charles Kennon.
roughs.	Elberton, Rev. Ethel Tucker
Hampton, Rev. John S. West-	Wrightsboro, Columbia co.
wood.	Robert M'Corkee.
Physic Spring, Buckingham co.	Macon, Rev. Charles Williams.
Rev. L. Walker.	Hebron, R. Blount.
Winchester, Rev. G. A. Reed.	Wrightsboro, Rev. Charles Evans.
Pranty town, Samuel Kemble.	Madison, J. L. Moody.
Suffolk, Arthur Smith.	Rev. J. R. Lowry, Rain's Store.
Smithfield, G. O. F. Andrews.	TENNESSEE.
Clarksburg, Rev. Elias Bruen.	Clear creek, Edmund D. Tarver.
	Dr. Wm. B. Elgin.
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.	Franklin, Rev. C. H. Hines.
Washington, P. M. Pearson.	Civil Order, Rev. James Williams
Alexandria, Thomas Jacobs,	ALABAMA.
	Canton, B. Higginbotham.
PENNSYLVANIA.	Greensborough, Rev. Dr. J. Meek
Philadelphia, Rev. J. Smith.	Tuscaloosa, Dr. Samuel M. Meek
Village Green, Del. co. P. Price.	Florence, James H. Weakley.
Union Town, Mr. Roberts.	Washington, Antauga co.
Pittsburg, Rev. Charles Avery.	Rev. Payton Bibb.
Kensington, Rev. H. R. Harrold	Hazel Green, Madison co.
Concord, J. Pumroy.	Rev David Goodnea.
Martinsburg, Wm. Bowen.	Greenville, Dr. E. H. Cook.
Carlisle, James H. Devor.	VERMONT.
Washington, J. L. Sands.	Bristol, A. H. Otis.
Union Town, John Phillips.	Wallingford, Rev. C. Walker
Harrisburg, Philip Ensminger.	Burlington, Rev. N. Gage.
DELAWARE.	Hinesburg, Daniel Norton.
Seaford Rev. Dr. Wm. Morgan.	North Hero, Grand Isle co
	N. Hutchinson.
NEW YORK.	MASSACHUSETTS.
New York, I. A. Easter.	Weston, Rev Joseph Snelling
Rev. George Thomas.	East Cambridge,
Pinkney, Lewis co.	Rev Thomas F. Norris,
Rev. J. B. Goodanough.	West Wareham Rev L D Johnson
Utica, Rev. M. Burdge.	Feltonville, Silas Goodnow,
Peekskill, A. J. Piercy.	Lowell, W. Wyman.
Albany, C. Hepinstall.	CONNECTICUT.
Cherry Valley, Otsego co. J. Wells.	Hope Valley, Peter Griffing.
Honey Lake, Richmon, Dr. James	Ridgefield, Rev. J. L. Ambler.
Covel.	LOUISIANA.
NEW JERSEY.	New Orleans, Wm M Goodrich,
Pemberton, Burlington co.	Wesley Coleman
Rev. Samuel Budd.	ARKANSAS TERRITORY.
OHIO.	Cane Hill, Rev Jacob Sexton
Cincinnati, Wm. L. Chappell.	MISSISSIPPI.
Deersville, Charles Lukens.	Eldersville, Jones co
New Ark, Wm. M'Colm,	Rev John M' McCormick
Alexander Woodrow.	UPPER CANADA.
Zanesville, O. White.	Hamilton, Gore District, John
Springfield, Rev. Saul Henkle.	Flanagan.

PRINTED BY WILLIAM WOODY, No. 6, S. Calvert-st. Baltimore.